

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

NABIL GHAWI,

Plaintiff,

v.

LAW OFFICES HOWARD LEE SCHIFF, P.C.,
JEANINE M. DUMONT, HEATH A. TIBERIO,
REBECCA JADACH, QUANESHIA DAILEY-
THOMPSON, and CITIBANK, N.A.,

Defendants.

Civil No. 3:13-cv-115 (JBA)

August 11, 2015

RULING ON CITIBANK'S PENDING MOTIONS

As set forth on the record this date, Citibank's motion to strike [Doc. # 130] Plaintiff's Objection to Citibank's Local Rule 56(a) Statement is GRANTED as to the substance of the Objection because Local Rule 56 does not provide for "objections" to statements of undisputed fact, but it is DENIED as to the attached telephone records. Citibank's motion to strike [Doc. # 129] Mr. Ghawi's Counter-Affidavit Rebutting Elizabeth Barnette's Declaration is GRANTED insofar as the "Counter-Affidavit" does not "set out facts that would be admissible in evidence," based on "personal knowledge." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)(4). Citibank's motion to amend its answer [Doc. # 106] is GRANTED because its delay in filing the amended answer is, while not fully explained, not undue in light of the procedural posture of this case. No further motions to amend will be granted for any party.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/

Janet Bond Arterton, U.S.D.J.

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut this 11th day of August, 2015.